DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 282 951 UD 025 559

AUTHOR Harvey, Jim
TITLE Ethnicity and Gender in Australian Education.
PUB DATE Apr 87
NOTE 26p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (Washington, DC, April 20-24, 1987).
PUB TYPE Information Analyses (070) -- Reports - General (140) -- Speeches/Conference Papers (150)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Attitude Change; Educational Discrimination; *Educationally Disadvantaged; *Equal Education; Ethnic Discrimination; Females; Foreign Countries; *Government School Relationship; *Multicultural Education; Political Issues; Politics of Education; *Sex Bias
IDENTIFIERS *Aboriginal People; *Australia

ABSTRACT

The Australian education system is denying equity and social justice to ethnic minorities and women. This paper examines the development of Australia's educational policy for those two groups. It argues that the educational disadvantages they have experienced have been enhanced by the marginalization of the issues. Policies such as multicultural education and non-sexist curricula have failed to redress the imbalance because they moved the focus away from structural inequalities which reproduce the disadvantages of ethnic minorities and women and instead focused upon cultural and attitudinal characteristics of the group themselves. In the current climate of economic recession and increasingly centralized control of curricula in Australia, moves to "mainstream" educational programs for women and ethnic minorities merely represent a shift from marginalization to over-generalization, creating policies intended for "all" students, but which fail to be informed by the different educational experiences and outcomes of the two groups. This report is divided into discussions of the following: (1) state ideology and educational policy in Australia; (2) the structure of the Australian education system; (3) curriculum innovation and the process of marginalization; (4) the bureaucratization process; and (5) from marginalization to mainstream: incorporating ethnicity and gender into all aspects of the schooling process. (PS)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

6-1-87

ED282951

ETHNICITY AND GENDER IN AUSTRALIAN EDUCATION

JIM HARVEY

South Australian College of Advanced Education

Adelaide, Australia.

Paper given at the American Educational Research Association Annual Meeting, Washington D.C., April 1987

UD025559

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

A. J. Harvey
South Australian College of Advanced Ed.

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy

INTRODUCTION

Analysis of the responses by Australian education systems to increased awareness of the educational disadvantages experienced by ethnic minority and female students provides illuminating examples of the processes by which state ideologies are reconstructed to subsume changed social, political and economic realities.

In the early 1970s educational responses to mass migration and the educational disadvantages of girls were added to the ever-expanding list of educational 'problems'. Documentation and analysis of the disadvantaged position of immigrant (now "ethnic") and female students in Australian education systems both deepened and amplified awareness to the point where the disadvantages experienced were difficult to dispute. Yet, despite this increased awareness, the issues surrounding educational provisions for both ethnic children and girls took considerable time to find a central position in policy making and educational agenda setting in Australia.

This paper examines some of the major policy documents and argues that the educational disadvantages experienced by the two groups have been reproduced through the marginalization of the issues. Further, it is argued that in both areas, policies such as multicultural education and non-sexist curricula have failed to redress the imbalance because they moved the focus away from structural inequalities which reproduce the disadvantages of ethnic minorities and women and instead focused upon cultural and attitudinal characteristics of the group themselves.

Finally, it is argued that in the current climate of economic recession and increasingly centralized control of curricula, moves to 'mainstream' educational programmes in the two areas merely represent a shift from marginalization to over-generalization - creating policies intended for 'all' students, but which fail to be informed by the different educational experiences and outcomes of the two groups.

FOOTNOTE

This analysis is based on a notion of Australia as a culturally diverse society. It excludes the most obvious and the most disadvantaged cultural group - the indigenous Aboriginal Australians. Of all groups in Australia, of course, they are the most in need of cultural support if not resurrection, and the group most disadvantaged by the process of institutionalized racism and discrimination. Their deliberate omission here is some recognition that Aboriginal Australians have decided that they must control their own destiny. The Aborigines' policy of self-determination has, by conscious choice, placed them outside current mulitcultural policies. They believe that they alone can reconstruct their culture from its almost total annihilation. When this is closer to achievement they will choose a method of negotiating their entry into multicultural Australia.

1. STATE IDEOLOGY AND EDUCATIONAL POLICY IN AUSTRALIA

The responses by the State to the rise of significant social movements, particularly as they are represented in educational policies, provide important insights into the processes by which State ideologies are reconstructed to accommodate, and in some cases to direct, these changed social, political, economic and educational realities. Nowhere are these processes more apparent than in the areas of educational policies for immigrants and girls.

By the early 1970s the educational disadvantages experienced by immigrant and female students had been well documented. Theoreticians such as Bernstein (1970) and Bourdieu (1973) had focussed attention for the first time on the central role of schools in the reproduction of social, cultural and (implicitly) gender formations. Schools had become recognized as central to any attempts by the State to redress the disadvantages derived from structurally situated sources. Finally, educational policy makers had begun to develop policies aimed at redressing these educational 'problems'.

Educational policy, however, does not occur in a social or ideological vacuum. The previous policies of assimilation of immigrants and the maintenance of existing gender relationships had gradually been replaced by an increased awareness of the political implications of the rise of ethnicity and the women's movement. By 1971 the immigrant population not only constituted 21% of the Australian population, but was also becoming a significant component in the electorate. Political parties and to a lesser extent trade unions were beginning to reflect Post World War II immigration both in their membership, workplace representatives and in their public policies. By the 1981 Federal election one out of seven voters was an immigrant. The resulting

politics of ethnicity, and particularly such issues as ethnic rights and a growing awareness of the economic and labourforce disadvantages experienced by migrant men and women could no longer be avoided.

The rise of the women's movement as a political force in Australia is more difficult to trace. The publication of the polemical writings of Millet (1969), Greer (1971) and Firestone (1972) galvanized collective responses in predominantly middle-class Australian women. The formation of the Women's Electoral Lobby (W.E.L.) and other politically motivated women's groups provided a forum for the advocacy of changes in social, economic and educational policies. However, changes in state ideology and policies as they affected women were far slower. Whereas the first major Commonwealth Government initiative in 'migrant' education was the Child Migrant Education Program (CMEP, 1971), the first statement of educational policy addressing the specific needs of girls and women was contained in Girls, School and Society (Schools Commission Australia, 1975) - and this despite the fact that women constituted fifty-one percent of the electorate and seventy per cent of the teaching workforce.

Interpretation of this resistance by the State to implement changes in educational policies in areas of obvious societal need depends upon an understanding of two issues. Firstly, we require an appreciation of the structure of the Australian education system - especially its sources of funding and its administrative structure. Secondly, we require an understanding of the processes of curriculum innovation, especially the ways in which the State involves itself.

THE STRUCTURE OF THE AUSTRALIAN EDUCATION SYSTEM

Education policies in Australia are determined by the interests of two levels of government: Commonwealth and State. Until the late 1960s the two sets of interests had been separate - despite the long-standing controversy of State Aid for private schools[1]. State Education Departments have primary responsibility for education across enormous geographic areas. These State Departments were characterized by a centralized bureaucracy located in the capital city which promulgated curricula on a State-wide basis. As a consequence, there were low levels of community involvement. Resistance to change was facilitated by the structural inertia of the bureaucracy and by its remoteness from public 'access'.

During the early 1970s Commonwealth-State relations in education changed. Essentially there is still rigidity. However, the creation of the Schools Commission in 1973, together with earlier grants to private schools for libraries and science equipment, provided the Commonwealth Government with a means through which financial, policy and curriculum inputs could be made to the State education systems. This has been the major conduit of curriculum innovation in the related areas of migrant, ethhnic and multicultural education, and the education of girls.

2. CURRICULUM INNOVATION AND THE PROCESS OF MARGINALIZATION

Analysis of the processes of curriculum innovation - particularly in areas where the State is attempting to defuse potentially divisive social movements - provides interesting examples of the processes adopted by the State to accommodate and in some areas to control these movements.

As discussed earlier, education policies in the general areas of multicultural education and the education of girls are responses to demographic, social and political changes in society. Examination of the major policy documents in these areas indicate that a series of inter-related and common processes are employed with the initial aim of marginalizing the issues. It is to an analysis of these processes of marginalization that I now wish to turn.

In general, there are two components common to the marginalization processes of ethnic and gender issues in educational policy. These are:

(i) individual deficit explanations of educational disadvantages identified in the two target groups

(ii) the creation of Advisory Committees and other forms of participatory policy-making - the 'bureaucratization' process

(i) Cultural Explanations of Educational Disadvantage

Explanations of educational disadvantage in Australia have moved through a variety of phases. Early education policies for

immigrant children such as the CMEP (1971) focussed upon two aspects: teaching English and becoming citizens.

This reflected the paradigm of majority/minority group education known as assimilation which held currency in both the Anglo-conformist ideology of the State and in education practice at the time. Immigrants and more particularly their children were expected to become 'Australian' - whatever that meant - as quickly as possible. Schools were the main assimilationist agencies (Smolicz 1971).

The CMEP acknowledged the growing awareness amongst Australian educators of the experiences of immigration and resettlement; particularly the disadvantages experienced in schools by those children with inadequate competency in English. It also employed cultural characteristics such as 'speaking mother-tongue at home' as an explanation of the frequent educational 'failure' of these children[2]. This successfully deflected responsibility away from schools and located the blame in the language and cultural characteristics of immigrant groups in general and individual children and their families in particular.

The next phase in the development of these culturally-deterministic explanations of educational disadvantage was to focus upon the notion of 'equality of opportunity'. Officially this move was proclaimed in Schools in Australia: Report of the Interim Committee for the Australian Schools Commission (1973). For the first time the processes of schooling

and their role in more general explanations of social inequality were addressed in official government policy.

Girls School and Society (1975), published by the Schools Commission, was the first detailed investigation and documentation in Australia of the processes by which girls are disadvantaged in education. This report took up the Schools Commission's earlier focus upon equality of opportunity. In brief, the recommendations contained in Girls School and Society were premissed on the view that:

> "Equality of opportunity cannot be achieved where the forces acting on all girls, irrespective of social class or ability, cause them to have lower self-esteem and less self-confidence than boys, and where those forces go unquestioned and unchallenged' (p.iii)

The strategies for action contained in the major recommendations took as their primary foci the changing of the attitudes and behaviour of girls, curriculum modification and the widening of career aspirations and opportunities for girls through improved vocational guidance. The recommendations also advocated improved promotion opportunities for female teachers to provide role-models of women in positions of power and leadership. Each of these is an important objective. However, they surely should not have remained the sole focus.

The emphasis upon girls' attitudes and other ascribed cultural characteristics (e.g. limited career aspirations) "blamed the victim(s)" be they girls or female teachers. Such a perspective located the systematic disadvantage of girls in their

gender, rather than in class, and in male-dominated institutions such as the labourforce and its culture.

By the time the Schools Commission Report for the Triennium 1976-1978 was published in 1975 a new cultural explanation of educational disadvantage was being employed. Schools were still considered the location of educational disadvantage. However, the systematic educational disadvantages of ethnic children and girls were now viewed as being derived from the failure of schools to reflect their culture rather than the previous assertions which blamed the 'victims' for their cultural differences.

Changes were also occurring in the dominant ideology of the State. The then Minister for Immigration was asserting that Australia was a multicultural, multi-ethnic and multi-lingual society. This was considered to be self-evident through the obvious presence of immigrants and the existence of ethnic groups. From these everyday experiences of cultural pluralism it was argued that these demographic facts should be reflected in public policies in general and particularly in education policies. Schools were to become the major site of intervention for the multicultural initiatives of the State (Grassby, 1973).

Each Education Department promulgated a multicultural education policy statement which paid verbal if not administrative homage to the general tenets of multiculturalism. Within these policy frameworks developed a range of school-based meanings of multicultural education (Hannan 1983).

The major thrust of Australian schools' responses were in curriculum modification and a push for cultural inclusiveness. In multicultural education, the emphasis was generally a

fossilized and stereotypical representation of the cultures of larger non-British groups. The emphasis was on life-style, the day-to-day and generally private aspects of dress, food and festivals. Such depictions of culture were taught from a non-critical, relativistic perspective which avoided the contentious and problematic areas of culture. At best this approach was tokenistic because of its failure to address such central issues as the experiences of immigration: the prejudice, discrimination and blatant racism which greeted immigrants to Australia, the dynamic nature of culture or the fundamental issue of the educational disadvantages experienced by many ethnic minority children. As one commentator described it "this is singing and dancing on the dole queue".

Much effort has been expended on implementing programs which take as their focus cultural variables ascribed to girls. These range from programs aimed at increasing girls' participation and achievement in mathematics, science and technology to those which specifically focus on improving girls' self concepts, self-esteem and achievement motivation. Cultural variables derived from processes internal to schooling, such as classroom interaction patterns, modes of assessment and broadening subject choice, have also been the focus of such policies. Finally, 'girl-friendly' curriculum and the creation of separate classes and schools to remove girls from the competitive patriarchical presence of male students and teachers have been proposed.

Yates (1985) argues:

> To some extent, and in different ways, all of these practices can be seen as real attempts not just to select from and redirect culture but to contradict it, to disown the treatment of women in mainstream culture. In so far as this is so, it is likely to be a problem, both for the success of the strategies and for the directions in which they are heading (p.12)

The role of schools in the reproduction of social cultural and gender formations is not total nor is it inevitable (see Willis 1983). The translating of more positive attitudes and more-enhanced self concepts into collective action can empower girls to redefine class and status relations and enable them to relocate themselves as a group within the power structure. However this is unlikely to occur while educational policies for girls locate their disadvantages in cultural explanations and strategies for intervention are not integrated with the general curriculum.

Sexism and its educational manifestations has its origins in the social and political history of Australia - just as do other forms of inequality. Educational policies which fail to address these issues are impotent because they marginalize explanations of structural inequality by locating it in culture. Culture is embedded in a social structure - it is not a separate entity.

3. THE BUREAUCRATIZATION PROCESS

During the initial period of development of responses to cultural pluralism and women's issues, a perceptible shift in the Commonwealth Government's involvement in educational decision making became apparent. The previous conservative bureaucratic practices of State Education Departments which were highly resistant to change were replaced by a growing official awareness of the central importance of negotiation and community involvement. Further, advocates of the new notions of equity and participation for minority groups in the development of public, social and educational policies had achieved positions of influence in the State apparatus through their appointment to the Schools Commission and other policy-making bodies. By 1975 the issues had been placed on the educational agenda.

To some extent these responses were productive. Policies were to change their focus from migrants and girls as 'problems' to one which promoted tolerance, equity, participation and an inclusive description and definition of cultural pluralism. However, the State retained control over the implementation processes by employing two powerful bureaucratic practices.

One response was for official policies in both areas to advocate changes in emphasis rather than structure. Perspectives on Multicultural Education (1979) produced by the Committee on Multicultural Education of the Australian Ethnic Affairs Council illustrates this form of response. This report advocated the development of educational policies in four areas: intercultural education, the maintenance of cohesion and unity through studies in migration; the maintenance of cultural and linguistic heritage

and the teaching of English as a Second Language. The emphasis was upon the creation of culturally appropriate curricula which reflected the new directions of Australian multicultural education: education in and for a multicultural society[3]. Racism and prejudice were represented as aberrant attitudes which could be changed by the provision of 'correct' information and appropriate learning situations such as intercultural and migration studies programs. Under this broader meaning of multicultural education, the target population was enlarged from children of ethnic background to "all Australian children" (1979:2). The central aim was to promote 'cohesion and unity' through individual conversion, increased tolerance and reduced prejudice. Nowhere were the issues of equity and improved participation of ethnic children in Australian schools addressed.

At one level this response can be viewed as a reconciliation of the divergent demands of ethnic groups on the one hand, and the need for social cohesion on the other. At another level, this change in policy direction can be argued to be an example of the State involving itself in educational policies for reasons of social control. The demands for ethnic rights and increased social equity were seen by some as potentially divisive of Australian society and as challenging the existing social order.

A second response of the State was to "bureaucratize" significant social movements. By this process governments were variously forced to create Ethnic and Women's Advisory Committees, Ministries of Ethnic Affairs and Equal Opportunity Officers whose proclaimed function was to advise governments on multicultural and women's issues.

One outcome of this process was that official support became potentially diversionary. Bureaucracies were able to deflect the focus of legitimate minority group concerns by referring potentially difficult issues to the plethora of advisory committees they had created. Another outcome was to slow down and eventually control initiatives originating from these groups while still maintaining an official commitment to negotiation and community involvement.

The final strategy was to use these bodies to create the false impression that significant changes were occurring. As Yates in an analysis of non-sexist education in Australia argues:

> Although the growth of equal opportunity units is a visible sign of doing something about a system which disadvantages girls, the conditions under which appointees are required to operate may hide some more subtle and diffuse processes of discrimination and alienation, as well as allow those to continue. (op.cit.)

These apparent changes may mask the reality that the State's principal purpose is to ensure that no major redirection of policy occurs and that no fundamental questioning of the social order takes place.

FROM MARGINALIZATION TO MAINSTREAM

SELF-IMPOSED MARGINALIZATION:

The marginalization processes previously described were maintained as "self-imposed" marginalization by advocates of full-time ethnic schools and single-sex schools for girls. By the early 1980s a number of full-time Greek schools had been established in Melbourne, Sydney and Adelaide, the major centres of Greek settlement in Australia. Part-time after school and

Saturday ethnic schools had become a well-established part of many ethnic groups' push for the maintenance of their culture. The ethnic school movement derived considerable impetus from the rise of ethnic awareness as well as the continuing public debate concerning the role of education in the promotion of multiculturalism. Ethnic groups, which previously had experienced financial difficulty maintaining their part-time schools, benefitted greatly from per capita grants from the Commonwealth. This newly-acquired financial support was used to improve facilities and teaching conditions in these part-time schools. Full-time ethnic schools developed as an inevitable consequence of the inadequate theoretical formulations of cultural maintenance generated by attempts to legitimate the incorporation of cultural diversity into the general structure of society[3].

Similarly, Girls School and Society had raised the possibility that schooling for girls without the presence of boys might be advantageous (op.cit.:11). Girls-only secondary schools had existed in both the State and private school systems for many years. In general, these schools were either academically or socially selective. Some State girls-only schools catered for the academic elite. Entrance examinations were employed to restrict entry and maintain academic standards. Other schools catered for the traditional educational needs of girls providing programs which focussed on domestic skills and employment in gender-specific areas such as office work, nursing and dressmaking. Private girls' schools were socially-selective because of their reliance on fees for their income. The resurgence of interest in girls-only schooling evident in Girls,

School and Society was taken up by a number of State Education Departments. The proponents argued that such schools were more conducive to girls achieving their full academic potential (see Willis & Kenway: 1986).

Both forms of self-imposed marginalization failed to address the fundamental issue of the ways in which schools interact with society. Separation based on ethnicity produces biculturalism at best. The central tenets of the prevailing notions of multiculturalism are its emphases upon cohesiveness and interaction. The full-time withdrawal of one category of children decreases considerably the potential for any interactive understanding of cultural diversity - the avowed aim of multicultural education. Separation based on gender suffers the same potential conceptual inadequacy because of its inability to deconstruct sexism. Sexism is embedded in social interaction - it does not exist in isolation.

Further, the vulnerability to financial and resource constraints of programs based on self-marginalization is obvious. Changed economic and political circumstances render marginal activities liable to the vagaries of political and administrative expedience. Majority interests generally take precedence in these circumstances.

MAINSTREAMING:

Mainstreaming is the inclusion of issues of gender and ethnicity in all educational policies and practices including curriculum, school organization and classroom processes. It had its origins in the search to strike a balance between the

provision of specialist programs such as multicultural education and the education of girls, whilst ensuring that all educational policies and practices address these issues. It is a new form of universalism which attempts to incorporate ethnicity and gender into all aspects of the schooling process.

During times of economic restructuring and recession, statements of education policies tend to proffer the rubric of "efficiency and effectiveness" (Ryan 1986:68-70). Economic determinism also underpins much of the rhetoric justifying moves to centralize control of curricula and to introduce a core curriculum. Accountability, especially in areas of public policy, becomes the catch cry. Thus, mainstreaming becomes an option when the State is pressed to provide credible programs on the one hand, with deminishing resources on the other.

Schools have also become central to counters by the State to increasing and politically damaging rates of youth unemployment. The relationship between girls' experiences of schooling and their labour force participation is a major theme in Girls and Tomorrow (Australian Schools Commission, 1984). One of the main conclusions was that:

> There are arguments based on equity and on utility for overcoming girls' disadvantages in schools. A society which wastes a substantial proportion of its human potential limits its own development and creates costs for itself. Women have the potential to contribute significantly to economic recovery. Their earnings are often crucial to the economic security of their families and are essential to strengthening consumer demand.
> (1984:7, emhasis added)

This new emphasis upon the utilitarian "virtues" of education and the more positive view of women's economic contribution

represents a significant stage in moves by the State to mainstream initiatives aimed at improving the educational experiences of girls - if only for reasons of economic expediency.

Finally, meeting the full educational needs of girls is declared a mainstream professional responsibility in the recently released A National Policy for Girls (Schools Commission, 1986). This report recommends a comprehensive national policy involving both Commonwealth and State education authorities. It reiterates many of the major themes of earlier documents while concentrating particularly on the educational needs of girls. It also outlines frameworks for the implementation and ongoing review of such policies.

What is immediately apparent in these two policies is that they are predicated on a belief that mainstreaming will be advantageous to girls. This implies a commonly-held view that educational opportunities are now generally open to all girls: they have a full range of subject choice, a wider range of career options, higher rates of retention at school, and higher roles of participation in higher education. The assumption is that the general issues of gender disadvantage have been addressed and the issues surrounding the special educational needs of girls can be taken up, supported, and the initiatives maintained by all teachers. Special provisions are no longer required.

To some extent there is some validity in this rationale. Girls, for example, currently have relatively higher school participation rates than boys (Schools Commission, 1986:17). Primary and secondary schools throughout Australia have been adopting more equitable resource allocations, introducing changes to gender-stereotyped areas of the curriculum and making

commitments to enhance girls' participation and levels of achievement in mathematics, science, sport and, more specifically, physical fitness. Much has been achieved through both policy initiatives and teacher-initiated activities.

However, the question at issue is how much has really changed? Increased participation rates may indicate that girls are staying on at school because they have been excluded from participation in the labour force - school is merely keeping them away from the dole queue. The Schools Commission offered another possible explanation:

> Moreover, while girls as a group are now staying at school longer than boys, different patterns of participation in significant curriculum areas persist, reflecting and reinforcing a division of labour which contributes to women's relatively higher levels of economic dependence.
> (ibid:17)

Australia's labour force has always been highly segregated by gender. Further, occupational segregation is a major determinant of wages, career structures as well as unemployment. Despite the increased participation by women in the labour force, much of this growth has been in secondary and tertiary sector occupations - the very areas where technological change and economic restructuring have occurred. Thus, there are sizeable structural impediments in the way of any major changes in women's career aspirations and participation in non-traditional sectors of the labour force. Increased equity in education must be accompanied by increased equity in labour force participation. Policies directed towards increasing the marketable labourforce skills of girls (Schools Commission, 1984) without advocating parallel fundamental changes in the structure of the labour force will be counterproductive.

Girls will become increasingly marginalized in the labour market with higher "marketable skills" and limited opportunities to apply them. Women's potential to "contribute significantly to economic recovery" will be lost.

A similar pattern of moving the focus of policy from specialist provision to the mainstream authorities exists in the general area of multiculturalism in Australia. However, in this case, the change has been far more abrupt. The link between economic policy and the mainstreaming of special interest, minority services became most evident in the Federal Budget of 1986. Faced with a massive budget deficit, the Commonwealth Government announced radical changes in policy in a number of areas of central concern to ethnic minority and multicultural interests. The Institute for Multicultural Affairs - the major research and policy advice centre in Australia - was closed down. The Special Broadcasting Service - the Commonwealth-funded multicultural television and radio service - was to be amalgamated with the Australian Broadcasting Corporation on the grounds of administrative efficiency. Multicultural education and Teaching English as a Second Language budgets were drastically cut. In each case, the demands of budgetary restraint and perceived decreased demand for these programs have been used to justify the underlying ideological acceptance of the mainstreaming of ethnic issues. Multiculturalism has always been at the fringe of the dominant ideology of Anglo-Conformism.

The mainstreaming of Multicultural Education may represent a retreat from previous commitments to provide equity, access and full participation for children from culturally-diverse backgrounds. Mainstreamed Multicultural Education with its

emphasis on intercultural studies and migration studies gives rise to a potential for overgeneralization. The reduced emphasis upon TESL, bilingual education and other forms of cultural maintenance is based on the same assumption which underpinned moves to mainstream educational provision for girls: namely, that education opportunities are now fully open to all children, regardless of gender or ethnic background. No conclusive data exist which substantiate this assertion.

CONCLUSION

Multicultural education is not a subject, nor should it be confined to subject areas of relatively low status such as Social Studies or Social Education. Properly constructed, multicultural education should reflect the experiences educationalists have acquired in catering for cultural diversity. This should be reflected in learning processes in classrooms which take into account what is already known about cultural factors and learning. Curricula in all subject areas and at all levels of education should be culturally-inclusive, reflecting the significant contributions of a wide range of cultures which are currently excluded from them. Multicultural education should be part of any notion of a core of knowledge essential for full participation in Australian society. For children of non-English speaking background, this form of education should seek to modify structural impediments and cultural arrangements which inhibit their full participation. Anglo-Australians should be empowered through knowledge and understandings of anti-racism (and non-sexism) to support the demands for equity and social justice for all Australians.

FOOTNOTES

1. "Private schools" refers to the two categories of non-government schools. The first category includes the predominantly Protestant colleges which have been largely modelled on the English "public schools". These schools receive some government funding but they also derive significant income from fees and endowments. The second category is composed mainly of Roman Catholic schools which are administrered by the church but receive substantial funding from the government. A small number of full-time ethnic schools is also included in this category.

2. "Failure" in this context refers to the negative evaluations given by teachers to children whose educational performance fails to meet narrowly-defined culturally specific norms.

3. For more detailed critiques of the theoretical inadequacies in the formulation of Australian multiculturalism see BULLIVANT, 1982, 1985; SMOLICZ, 1981, 1985.

REFERENCES

BERNSTEIN, B. 1970 'Education cannot compensate for society'. New Society 15 (387), pp.344-7.

BOURDIEU, P. 1971 'Systems of education and systems of thought' in Young, M.F.D. (Ed.) Knowledge and Control: New Directions for the Sociology of Education, pp.189-207. London: Collier-Macmillan.

BULLIVANT, B.M. 1981 The Pluralist Dilemma in Education. Sydney: George Allen & Unwin.

BULLIVANT, B.M. 1985 Educating the pluralist person: Images of society and educational responses in Australia, pp.76-90 in Poole M.W., de Lacey, P.R. & Randhawa, Bikkar S. (eds.) Australia in Transition: Culture and Life Possibilities. Sydney: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich.

FIRESTONE, S. 1972 The Dialectic of Sex: The Case for Feminist Revolution. London: Paladin.

GRASSBY, A.J. 1973 A Multicultural Society for the Future. Canberra: Australian Government Publishing Service.

GREER, G. 1971 The Female Eunuch. London: Paladin.

HANNAN, L. 1983 Problems and Issues for Teachers Making Decisions on Curriculum in Falk, B. & Harris, J. (Eds.) Unity in Diversity: Multicultural Education in Australia pp. 43-56. Melbourne: Australian College of Education.

MILLETT, K. 1969 Sexual Politics. London: Abacus.

RYAN, B. 1986 Revising the Agenda for a Democratic Curriculum. Australian Journal of Education, 30(1), 66-84.

SCHOOLS COMMISSION AUSTRALIAN 1973 Schools in Australia: Report of the Interim Committee for the Australian Schools Commission. Canberra: Australian Government Publishing Service.

SCHOOLS COMMISSION AUSTRALIAN 1975a Committee on Social Change and the Education of Women. Girls, School and Society. Canberra: Schools Commission.

SCHOOLS COMMISSION AUSTRALIAN 1975b — Schools Commission Report for the Triennium 1976-1978. Canberra: Australian Government Publishing Service.

SMOLICZ, J.J. 1971 — 'Is the Australian school an assimilationist agency?' Education News 13 (4) August pp.4-8.

SMOLICZ, J.J. 1981 — Core values and cultural identity. Ethnic and Racial Studies, 4(1), 75-90.

SMOLICZ, J.J. 1985 — Multiculturalism and an overarching framework of values: Education responses to assimilation, interaction and separatism in ethnically plural societies pp.76-90 in Poole, M., deLacy, P.R. & Randhaw, A. Bikkar (Eds.) Australia in Transition: Culture and Life Possibilities. Sydney: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich.

WILLIS, P. 1983 — Cultural Production and Theories of Reproduction pp.107-138 in Barton, L. & Walker, S. (Eds.) Race, Class and Education. London: Croom Helm.

WILLIS, S. & KENWAY, J. 1986 — On Overcoming Sexism in Schooling: To Marginalize or Mainstream. Australian Journal of Education 30 (2), pp.132-49.

YATES, L. 1985 — 'Curriculum Becomes Our Way of Contradicting Biology and Culture' - An Outline of Some Dilemmas for Non-Sexist Education. The Australian Journal of Education 29 (1), pp.3-16.